

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/173,423

Applicant(s)

DEICHMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle (Shelley) Thomson

Art Unit

3641

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michelle (Shelley) Thomson.

(3) _____.

(2) Henry Cummings.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 7-51.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant was advised that the numerous errors of the amendment dated 1/12/01 would not be entered due to the inability to match the amendments with the corresponding specification. Applicant was advised of the numerous spelling and grammatical errors still outstanding in the application. In Claim 25, the terms "solids" and "and mixtures thereof" were discussed. Applicant agreed to cancel "and mixtures thereof" from the claims and that the structure of the claimed valves and conduits would not be usable with a solid.


MICHAEL J. CARONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER